

PATENT
IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
(oracle01.026)

5	Applicant:	Guay, et al.	Confirmation No.:	3882
	Application No:	10/678,800	Group Art Unit:	2166
	Filed:	10/03/2003	Examiner:	Navneet K. Ahluwalia
10	Title: <i>Preserving sets of information in rollup tables</i>			

Commissioner for Patents
15 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Response to a non-final Office action under 37 C.F.R. 1.111

Status of the prosecution

Applicants filed a second RCE in this application on May 27, 2009 in which Claims 1-8, 25-32, and 49-56 were presented for examination. The independent claims are claims 1 and 25, with claim 25 being a Beauregard version of claim 1. Applicant received a first Office action in the RCE on June 23, 2009 in which Examiner rejected all claims as obvious over the Bakalash and Lore references. Examiner graciously granted a telephonic interview concerning the Office action on September 22, 2009. In the interview, Applicant's attorney used Applicants' FIG. 3 and Lore's FIG. 5 to demonstrate that the Lore reference did not disclose the aggregated entry set forth in Applicants' claims, and that consequently, the combination of Bakalash and Lore did not provide grounds for a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103. Examiner requested that Applicant incorporate the Specification's definition of *metric value* into the claims and further clarify the definition of the "second field" in the claims. Applicant is amending claims 1 and 25 as requested and will then use portions of the *Argument* which Applicant's attorney prepared for the interview to demonstrate that the combination of the references does not show all of the limitations of claims 1 and 25 as amended in the present response.

35

Please amend the claims as follows: